

following the law, doing everything according to American law.

That is the kind of person we want to come here, someone who has respect for the law.

We are helping her try to get her citizenship, but, unfortunately, that part of our government is only now looking at applications from September of last year. Hoping not to have to get yet another visa, surely this greatest Nation in the world could move faster on applications for citizenship and visas. Surely we could at least work as fast as Third World nations that don't have computers. Apparently, in some cases, we don't.

We owe it to all of those who have sought to come into America legally and to all of those who were born here, at least born here and are American citizens. The children of diplomats who are born in the United States are not U.S. citizens.

Originally, when the 14th Amendment passed—and you can go back and look at the debate, back at the time—the advocates for the 14th Amendment were saying obviously there will be people who have children born in America whose children will not be citizens. They contemplated that would be diplomats from foreign countries who are in this country legally as diplomats of foreign countries. Their children would not be citizens, and they are not.

They also contemplated that, if you snuck into this country illegally, certainly your children would not be citizens. That would be insane. Yet what they thought would be insane is the way things have been interpreted for far too long.

We ought to be able to say who can come into the country legally and approve anybody who comes in, whether legally or illegally, for citizenship on our own terms. That is the way it needs to be if we are going to perpetuate this amazing blessing of a country.

I didn't deserve to be born here, but I was. And if we are going to continue to be a light on the hill that so many hundreds of millions of people around the world want to come to, then we can't let hundreds of millions of people come here or it would overwhelm the country and it would no longer be a place anybody wanted to come. At that point, the greatest hope for peace in the world, the United States, would cease to be the United States we have come to know and love.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECOGNIZING WORLD AIDS DAY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank you, and I want to extend my courtesies to the gentleman from Texas for his courtesy as well, Mr. AL GREEN.

I stand here today because this is World AIDS Day. Since 1988, we have commemorated World AIDS Day. I have on my lapel, if you will, on my shawl, a red ribbon which symbolizes remembrance.

Earlier today I called in to the Thomas Street Clinic, as I have celebrated with them for many years, and while I was in Washington, I wanted to give them the recognition as fighters against HIV/AIDS.

It does not seem that long ago, but HIV/AIDS affected many around the world before the disease even made its way to America's shores. Countless researchers, healthcare providers, politicians, and educators have contributed to the global initiative to contain and eventually eliminate its presence in all corners of the world.

I remember going to Zambia on the first Presidential trip dealing with HIV/AIDS around the world. 38.6 million people worldwide were living with HIV at the end of 2005, and more than 25 million have died of AIDS since 1981.

In December, we remember that, and that is what this day is: a day of remembrance, when an estimated 1 million to 1.2 million HIV-positive individuals live in the United States and approximately 56,000 new infections occur every year.

Mr. Speaker, my district is impacted, upwards of 22,000 people. Texas is impacted.

Today is a day of remembrance to honor those we lost and to commit to those we fight for.

Mr. Speaker, established by the World Health Organization in 1988, December 1st is universally known as World AIDS Day.

World AIDS Day serves to focus global attention on the devastating impact of the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

All governments, national AIDS programs, churches, community organizations and individuals are given the opportunity to display their commitment to fight this deadly disease.

It has been more than 30 years since the first AIDS case was reported in the United States.

It does not seem like it was too long ago, but HIV/AIDS had affected many around the world before the disease even made its way to America's shores.

Since then, countless researchers, healthcare providers, politicians, and educators have contributed to the global initiative to contain and eventually eliminate its presence in all corners of the world.

Although HIV/AIDS is no longer a mysterious and mischaracterized entity, it is the most relentless and indiscriminate killer of our time.

And though a diagnosis is no longer the sealing of an immediate fate, it is the beginning of an indefinite battle for life, adequate health care, and for social belonging.

With an estimated 38.6 million people worldwide living with HIV at the end of 2005, and more than 25 million people having died of AIDS since 1981, December 1st is a date which serves to remind everyone that action makes a difference in the fight against HIV/AIDS.

Let there be no mistake, we are here to acknowledge that AIDS is a deadly enemy

against which we must join all our forces to fight and eliminate.

Americans should be reminded that HIV/AIDS does not discriminate.

With an estimated 1,039,000 to 1,185,000 HIV-positive individuals living in the U.S., and approximately 56,000 new infections occurring every year, the U.S., like other nations around the world, is deeply affected by HIV/AIDS.

The detrimental effects of HIV/AIDS have also hit home. More than 65,000 people in Texas are living with HIV.

Thirty-six percent more Texans are living with HIV today than just seven years ago. In 2010, studies showed that 1 in every 3 diagnosed persons in Texas were not getting proper medical treatment.

We must make certain that every affected individual receive efficient medical treatment that will afford them long life.

Not only is the state of Texas suffering from HIV and AIDS, but my district, the 18th Congressional District of Texas, has seen an increasing number of people living with the disease.

In 2010, there were over 22,000 reported persons living with HIV (non-AIDS) in the greater Houston area, and more than 9,000 reported persons living with AIDS.

This problem continues to escalate as there have been 1,700 new infections each year among individuals in Harris County, particularly among racial and ethnic minorities.

We must continue to fight a tough fight to reverse all of these costly and tragic trends.

I will continue to sponsor and co-sponsor legislation that addresses the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

The fight is not over.

We must continue to stand strong in our struggle to conquer some old and new challenges that we as Americans and members of the global community encounter.

Today, Friday, December 1st, is World AIDS Day.

And, we will focus on HIV/AIDS, prevention and awareness, and continue to fight for life.

Together, we will help all of our friends, relatives, and children live healthy and full lives.

REASONS WHY PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP SHOULD BE IMPEACHED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCSHON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leadership for this opportunity. I greatly appreciate any opportunity to stand here in the well of the Congress of the United States of America.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, because I do love my country. I rise because I want persons to know that there are certain things that are not being presented properly, and one of the things that is not being presented properly as it relates to impeachment is the notion that a President has to commit a crime to be impeached. I would like to talk about this for a moment and then address some of the issues associated with impeachment.

A President doesn't have to commit a crime to be impeached. Article II, section 4 of the Constitution of the United States of America is where we find information, if you will, on impeachment. It is stated in Article II, section 4 that a President can be impeached for treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that a misdemeanor is defined as a misdeed. There is a definition associated with criminology, but when the Framers of the Constitution decided that impeachment would be a remedy for a President who might be styled a runaway President, they decided that "misdemeanor" would mean misdeed.

In fact, we have had a President impeached for a misdeed. Andrew Johnson, in 1868, President, was impeached for the high misdemeanor, misdeed, if you will, of saying things that were unkind about Congress.

He committed no crime. He breached no statute. He spoke ill will of Congress, and as such, he was impeached in article X of the Articles of Impeachment that were placed against him.

I would like to share some intelligence from some others who have spoken on this issue.

Gene Healy has spoken on the issue. He is with the Cato Institute, and his article is styled "The Overcriminalization of Impeachment." In this article, he states explicitly, on the second page, for those who might have a copy of it—I have filed this with the House previously—"Impeachable offenses aren't limited to crimes." He indicates that that is settled quite well among constitutional scholars.

He also goes on to say: "Had the Framers restricted impeachment to statutory offenses, they'd have rendered the power a 'nullity' from the start."

In the early Republic, there were very few crimes, and certainly not enough to cover the range of misdeeds—important word, "misdeeds"—that would rightly disqualify public officials from continued service—misdeeds, misdemeanors.

□ 1245

He goes on to say that it is important to get this straight because confusing impeachment with a criminal process can be harmful to our political health. It may lead us to stretch criminal law to get the President or his associates warping its future applications to ordinary citizens.

It is important that we get this straight because a crime, obviously, can be an impeachable offense, but it can also be something that a person is not impeached for, a President is not impeached for, depending upon the severity, I suppose. But a President can also be impeached for the misdeeds committed while in office.

One of the things that Mr. Healy addresses that I would like to point out that is important as it relates to why we have this belief that a President

must be impeached for a crime is this: unfortunately, we have outsourced the investigative function associated with impeachment to some other body, to some independent agency, to the Justice Department, if you will. In so doing, we have given the impression that this is something that involves a crime.

But the Framers of the Constitution thought long and hard about this, and they saw that there could be the appearance of impropriety, if we allowed the executive branch to investigate itself in the sense that the Justice Department is a part of the executive branch.

So do you really want the executive branch investigating the President, who is the chief executive officer?

There are times, such as what we have now, when you have the executive outsourcing the actual investigation to a third party. And my suspicion is that this can work quite well, but we should not conclude that because it is working, that because there is some functionality that seems to be positive for some, negative for others, that because it appears to be working that this is the only way that it can be done.

We shouldn't conclude that at the end of an investigation, if there is no finding of criminality, that an impeachment cannot go forward. Because notwithstanding the findings of a special investigator, or a special body that is assigned the task of investigating, we should not conclude that if there is not a finding of criminality that we cannot go forward with an impeachment.

As a matter of fact, we can go forward with an impeachment while a body is performing this function, while a body is investigating. We can go forward before there is an investigation by a body. We can go forward after there is an investigation.

The House of Representatives is the place where impeachment takes place. Any Member of the House of Representatives can bring Articles of Impeachment, and these Articles of Impeachment will have to be brought before the entirety of the House of Representatives. Impeachment is not limited to crimes committed, and a Member can bring Articles of Impeachment based upon the harm that a President is imposing upon society by virtue of the President's acts, behavior, or misdeeds, if you will. The President can be impeached without committing a crime.

I had the good fortune of being on a program with Chris Hayes last night. He is the host. He mentioned an article that is written by Ezra Klein. It is styled, "The case for normalizing impeachment. Impeaching an unfit President has consequences. But leaving one in office could be worse."

In this article that he has written, on the very last page he indicates that—by the way, I would commend this to persons to read in its entirety, but I

am, for need of time, going to limit myself to excerpts. He indicates that: "Impeachment is not a power we should take lightly; nor is it one we should treat as too explosive. There will be Presidents who are neither criminals, nor mental incompetents but who are wrong for the role, who pose a danger to the country and the world."

This is true. It can happen. I will say more about the possibilities in just a moment. Then there is the article from The Times, a U.K. newspaper, that I would commend to persons, and it indicates that "MPs accuse Donald Trump of 'spreading evil' over Britain First retweets."

This is an article that I highly commend because it speaks of how things can extend beyond our borders that start within our borders. I will read some of the excerpts.

It reads: "The Prime Minister said that Britain First, whose Twitter post the President retweeted, was a 'hateful organization' that 'seeks to spread division and mistrust among communities.'"

"She said the group stood in opposition to Britain, British values of respect, tolerance, and decency, and stressed that British Muslims were 'peaceful, law-abiding people who have themselves been victims of attack, of terror by the far right.'"

She went on to indicate, serving notice to Mr. Trump, that she would not shy away from tackling him if she thought these actions—excuse me—if she thought his actions misguided. She said: "The fact that we work together does not mean that we are afraid to say when we think the United States has got it wrong. And to be very clear with them, I am very clear that retweeting from Britain First was the wrong thing to do."

We have been criticized greatly for the retweet that was inaccurate, a retweet that, quite frankly, could have been vetted. When you are the President of the United States of America, you have access to intelligence about things happening around the world. You can validate, you can verify, you can vet things that are presented to you. The President has access to the greatest intelligence operation in the world and could easily vet before tweeting.

The information that was retweeted was not entirely correct, and it was hateful. It was designed to incite hate and it should not be the kind of thing that a President should retweet.

I would like to also read the style of an article from Foreign Policy. This article is styled, "This Is How Every Genocide Begins." This is by Daniel Altman. He indicates that Donald Trump's retweeting anti-Muslim propaganda videos in the most un-American—excuse me just a moment, please. I seem to be catching something. So please tolerate me if you would, Mr. Speaker. I thank the person who brought the elixir of life, water, over to me.

Again, Donald Trump's retweeting of anti-Muslim propaganda videos is the most un-American thing he has done as President. And he goes on to explain that we have to remove this President and his administration as soon as possible. We have to do it by legal means, upholding the foundations of our democracy.

We cannot expect help from the President's silent Cabinet, or his toadies in Congress who seem more interested in maintaining their own power than saying a word against him. We have to use the only branch of government left to us, the courts.

Now, he and I differ on this point. I do believe we can still bring Articles of Impeachment, but he concludes by saying this: The President is trying to generate panic against Muslims in America—and I am rephrasing—clearly putting them at risk of mob violence. He says he hopes that he will face the full force of the law before it is too late.

I might also go back a page or two and read this from this article. He indicates that the first thing that is done when we are going to move toward some sort of mob violence is to target a group by demonizing it by a campaign of hateful information.

He goes on to say: This is presented as legitimate information by people in positions of trust.

This article, I commend to persons as well.

Now, moving forward to our current situation. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that a President who is unmindful of the high duties of his high office, a President who is unmindful of the dignities and proprieties thereof, a President who has brought shame and disrepute upon the Presidency, who has breached his trust as President to the manifest injury of American society, such that he creates hate and hostility, this President who sows these seeds of discord, this kind of President should be impeached.

It is my opinion that a President who demeans a Member of Congress, as one example; who indicates that a Member of Congress performing duties as a Member of Congress, duties that were associated with a constituent, that such a Member of Congress is wacky; a President saying that a Member of Congress is wacky creates circumstances for the Member of Congress that are, to be very kind, quite unpleasant.

A President doing this to a Member of Congress has caused a great deal of concern. The Member of Congress has had threats made. The Member of Congress has had to take on extra security with great care and protect the staff. This is the kind of thing that we don't expect a Member of Congress to have to endure as a result of something a President might say.

A President who indicates that there will be a ban on Muslims coming into our country, a President should not single out a religious group and indi-

cate that they should be banned from a country. In doing this, the President singles out people such that those who are of ill will will look upon them as persons to be treated with some degree of disrespect and even horror.

A President who talks about persons who have signed up to serve in our military and who have not done anything dishonorable, but who says that, because they are transgender persons, they are persons who are not acceptable in the military, this sends a signal to people that incites people to believe that the President sees these persons as less than persons who should be in the military, persons who should be treated in some way other than respectful as members of the military.

A President who calls the mothers of persons who are professional athletes—SOBs is the term that was used; the "B" meaning that those persons were dogs, the mothers; calling them, the athletes themselves, sons of dogs—such a President is a person who is sowing seeds of discord. Such a President is a person who is inciting people to behave in a manner such that they would be antithetical to those persons who are the sons of persons that he had labeled as dogs. This is inappropriate behavior for a President.

A President who concludes that persons who are members of the KKK, persons who are neo-Nazis, call themselves supremacists. Such persons, when they are said to be very fine people, is a means of legitimizing people who are hateful, who are bigots, persons who have ill will for others in society simply because of who the others are. A President should not legitimize them by calling them very fine people.

This is a President who believes that the people of a given country who are subjects of the United States of America, but a President who indicates that these people want others to do things for them that they should be doing for themselves, or that they are a drain on the budget because they have been the victims of a force of nature.

□ 1300

A President who says these kinds of things sends a signal that indicates that these persons are not persons who are the best that we have in American society, because they are citizens. Puerto Ricans are citizens. A President who does this is a President who is sowing seeds of mistrust and sowing seeds of discord.

A President should not sow seeds of mistrust and discord. A President ought to be a unifying force within a country. A President ought to be the person whom we look to for some sense of stability. A President ought to be about the business of keeping a country together rather than creating chasms within various persons and groups within a society.

This is what young people expect of a President—young people who are witnessing a President do things that bring about distrust and sow the seeds

of discord are seeing something that is unusual and something that is not normal. We don't want them to assume that what they are seeing is the norm. As a matter of fact, we need to let them know that this is not the norm.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that these kinds of activities that create hate and hostility and that sow seeds of discord are impeachable.

These are the kinds of things that the Framers of the Constitution had in mind when they created Article II, section 4 of the Constitution.

This is what Alexander Hamilton had in mind when he penned Federalist No. 65. Hamilton so much as indicated that impeachment would create a lot of discord within society. The act itself, he indicated, could be very partisan. He indicated that there would be rancor—probably not in that specific term—but he indicated that people would be discombobulated to a great extent.

In so doing, he also went on to let us know that it is something that is necessary. It is something that has to happen when you have a President who has committed misdeeds such that that President can be removed from office, and it does not have to be for a crime.

This is something that constitutional scholars recognize, but it is also something that some people, for whatever reasons, do not acknowledge. They don't acknowledge it for reasons that I will allow them to explain. But the constitutional scholars, who have delved into this to levels that most people don't have, acknowledged that Presidents don't have to be impeached for crimes only.

As a matter of fact, in 1804, John Pickering, a Federal judge, was subject to impeachment. He was impeached, and he committed no crime that was noted in the Articles of Impeachment. He was impeached for being intemperate. As I indicated earlier, and I think some things bear repeating, Andrew Johnson was impeached in 1868. In the 10th article of the Articles of Impeachment, it was alleged that he demeaned Congress. He said bad things about Congress, and, as a result, he was impeached.

Now, no President has been convicted. Impeachment is within the province of the House of Representatives. If a majority of the Members vote to impeach, a President is then impeached, and the action moves to the Senate where there is a trial in the Senate presided over by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. If the President is found guilty, then the President is impeached and can be removed from office. The impeachment is validated, and the President can be removed from office.

But impeachment is something that occurs in the House of Representatives. It is something that each Member can bring before the House of Representatives. It is a responsibility that a Member of Congress can assume by virtue of being a Member of Congress in concluding that a President has committed impeachable offenses.

These impeachable offenses need not be crimes. I keep emphasizing this because really that is what this time is to be used efficaciously for. We want people to know, in no uncertain terms, that a President does not have to commit crimes to be impeached, that any of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives can bring Articles of Impeachment before the body, and that when these Articles of Impeachment are brought before the body, the House has to act.

How does the House have to act? The House of Representatives will allow the articles to be read once. Once they are read, there is a time set for them to be read a second time. I read Articles of Impeachment earlier, and I chose not to read them the second time. As a result, they were not read, and as a result of not being read, the articles were not acted upon by the body.

This is something every Member can do. By the way, when I did it, I did it as a result of my conscious decision to do so without any influence from any person on the planet Earth. It was a decision that was made before I came without any influence from any person. I am saying this with the emphasis that I place upon it, Mr. Speaker, because there is some misinformation. I am not offended by the misinformation, I just want to correct the record. These things get confused, and I understand it. Most people are not familiar with how this process works.

Moving along, once the time is set for the second reading, the articles are read the second time; and, thereafter, the articles may be voted up or down or there may be a request made that the articles be sent to a committee. If so, if a majority of the body concludes that they should go to committee, then they will, or there could be a motion or a request made to table the articles. If they are tabled, they will be tabled and likely not brought back before the body again. But if they are allowed to be voted up or down, if a majority of the Members conclude that impeachment is appropriate and say so by their vote, saying yes by their vote, then the President would be impeached, and it would go to the Senate. In the Senate, you would have to have a two-thirds vote to convict.

But if the request is to table the Articles of Impeachment, then those who do not favor impeachment can vote to table, because if you vote to table and that is successful, then you don't have to vote to impeach.

Those who do not favor impeachment can vote to have the articles sent to the Judiciary Committee. If they don't favor impeachment, then you can vote to send it to the Judiciary Committee, and there won't be a vote on impeachment.

There can be other reasons. I don't want to conclude that the only reason that a person would vote to table is because a person doesn't want to vote to impeach, but these are the reasons that are ostensibly viewed as reasons for

not voting for these various motions that can be made.

If I bring Articles of Impeachment, my desire will be to have the articles voted up or down. If they are voted up or down, that would accord everyone an opportunity to show the world where they stand on the question before the House, which, of course, would be impeachment. If a motion is made to table or a request to table, then I would vote against that because I support impeachment. If a motion is made to send to committee, I will vote against this because I favor impeachment.

This is important not only to me, but to my country. This is not about Democrats. It really is not. It is about the democracy. It is about government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It is about the Republic. It is not about Republicans. It is about whether we will be able to retain the Republic that we have. Many will recall that Franklin called to our attention that we have a republic when he addressed a certain person and indicated that you have "a republic, if you can keep it."

This is about keeping the Republic, Mr. Speaker. It is not about Democrats, and it is not about Republicans. It is about them in the sense that they are part of the House and they all have an opportunity to cast votes, but it is really not about something as simple as politics as usual.

This is something to be taken seriously. I do take it seriously. It is something that the country is monitoring. The country, when polled, indicates its position on impeachment, and that position has been at 40 percent, some a little bit above and some below, depending on who is polling and how you poll, I suppose. But the country is aware of what is going on. People are paying attention, and we do have a duty to bring before this body what we, in good conscious, believe is appropriate. "Good conscious" is a good term. I believe in good conscious that there is a time to bring impeachment before this body.

I repeat, I believe in good conscious that there is a time to bring impeachment before this body. I have expressed my position, and it is no secret. People know where I stand. People know that, as a Member of the Congress of the United States of America, I have made the position quite public. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, people know what my position is. They know that I have been straightforward. I have not been nebulous. I have not been shy. I believe what I say, and I say what I believe.

I believe that this country should not allow discord to emanate from the highest office in the land. I believe that this country should not allow the chief executive officer to incite hate and should not allow the chief executive officer to incite hostility. I believe that the chief executive officer ought to be a unifying force in a great country. I believe that if America is going to con-

tinue its greatness and move forward without persons who are labeled as wacky or persons being seen as less than other Americans by virtue of their religious practices or because of their sexuality, I believe that we have a duty when we believe that there is an impeachable offense, then we should bring this before the Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to serve the people of the Ninth Congressional District of Texas. The Ninth Congressional District of Texas is in Houston. I am honored to serve the people of Houston as well as Missouri City and Stafford. I am honored to serve, but I am a United States Congressman, and the Constitution of the United States of America addresses all of the people within the United States of America. So when I bring my views to the floor, when I stand in the well and make my comments, I am speaking for the people of the Ninth Congressional District. But I am also speaking for a good many people of the United States of America, and a good many people in the United States of America are of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that impeachment is not only appropriate but necessary.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that next week here in the Congress of the United States of America, I will bring Articles of Impeachment to present to this body such that Donald J. Trump will be impeached.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 4, 2017, at 6 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3262. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major notice — Medicaid Program; Final FY 2015 and Preliminary FY 2017 Disproportionate Share Hospital Allotments, and Final FY 2015 and Preliminary FY 2017 Institutions for Mental Diseases Disproportionate Share Hospital Limits [CMS-2409-N] (RIN: 0938-AB43) received November 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3263. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the thirteenth annual Federal Trade Commission